

DRAWING AMENDMENTS

FIG. 1 has been amended to add elements recited in the specification that were not in the original drawings. For example, FIG. 1 now includes a PL/I transformer 42, a C transformer 46, an HLASM transformer 50, and an RYO transformer 52. In addition, elements in FIG. 1 have been labeled to be consistent with their respective identifiers in the specification. Further, identifiers 10 and 12 have been added to make FIG. 1 consistent with the specification. Some items that were not given identifiers in the specification were deleted, such as “Plugins,” “MPP/IFP/BMP,” and “IMS.”

FIG. 3 has been amended to add blocks recited in the specification that were not in the original drawings. For example decision block 170, block 172, and decision block 196 have been added. In addition, the blocks of FIG. 3 have been renumbered to include the added blocks and for consistency with the specification.

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-27 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 28-48 have been added.

Amendment to the Title

The title has been amended as requested in the Office Action.

Amendment to Specification

The specification has been amended for consistency with the Figures. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

The Office objects to claims 2-6, 8-21, and 23-26, at paragraph 5 of the Office Action, because of informalities associated with claims 2-6, 8-21, and 23-26. Applicants respectfully submit that none of the objections apply to the new claims 28-48.

35 U.S.C. §101 Rejections

The Office has rejected claims 22-27, at paragraph 6 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §101. Applicants respectfully submit that the new claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Claims 28-48 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 1-27, at paragraphs 7-35 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0038336 (“Abileah”). The Office has also rejected claims 1-27, at paragraphs 36-63 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0046294 (“Brodsky”). Additionally, the Office has rejected claims 1-27, at paragraphs 64-91 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0021292 (“Chiang”). Further, the Office has rejected claims

1-27, at paragraphs 92-119 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0111464 ("Ho"). Applicant(s) respectfully traverse the rejections.

Independent Claim 28

None of the cited references, including Abileah, Brodsky, Chiang, and Ho, disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 28. For example, Abileah, Brodsky, Chiang, and Ho do not disclose receiving an input request at an IMS connect program from a user computer, where the user computer is associated with a client that provides software to access the IMS connect program independent of a web server, as recited in claim 28. Abileah, Brodsky, Chiang, and Ho also do not disclose transmitting an XML output response to the user computer via a communication path that is independent of the web server, as recited in claim 28. Abileah discloses receiving an XML document at an IMS connect program from clients via a web server, but Abileah does not disclose providing access to the IMS connect program for clients that provide their own software to communicate with the IMS connect program without using a web server. (See Abileah, Figure 8 and paragraph [0074]). Thus, Abileah does not disclose receiving an input request at an IMS connect program from a user computer that is associated with a client that provides software to access the IMS connect program independent of a web server, as recited in claim 28. In addition, Abileah does not disclose transmitting an XML output response to the user computer via a communication path that is independent of the web server, as recited in claim 28.

Further, Brodsky discloses receiving an XML document at an IMS connect program from clients via a web server, but Brodsky does not disclose providing access to the IMS connect program for clients that provide their own software to communicate with the IMS connect program without using a web server. (See Brodsky, Figure 8 and paragraph [0105]). Thus, Brodsky does not disclose receiving an input request at an IMS connect program from a user computer that is associated with a client that provides software to access the IMS connect program independent of a web server, as recited in claim 28. In addition, Brodsky does not disclose transmitting an XML output response to the user computer via a communication path that is independent of the web server, as recited in claim 28. Additionally, Chiang discloses

receiving an XML document at an IMS connect program from clients via a web server, but Chiang does not disclose providing access to the IMS connect program for clients that provide their own software to communicate with the IMS connect program without using a web server. (See Chiang, Figure 8 and paragraph [0077]). Thus, Chiang does not disclose receiving an input request at an IMS connect program from a user computer that is associated with a client that provides software to access the IMS connect program independent of a web server, as recited in claim 28. In addition, Chiang does not disclose transmitting an XML output response to the user computer via a communication path that is independent of the web server, as recited in claim 28. Also in contrast to claim 28, Ho discloses receiving an XML document at an IMS connect program from clients via a web server, but Ho does not disclose providing access to the IMS connect program for clients that provide their own software to communicate with the IMS connect program without using a web server. (See Ho, Figure 8 and paragraph [0088]). Thus, Ho does not disclose receiving an input request at an IMS connect program from a user computer that is associated with a client that provides software to access the IMS connect program independent of a web server, as recited in claim 28. In addition, Ho does not disclose transmitting an XML output response to the user computer via a communication path that is independent of the web server, as recited in claim 28. Hence, claim 28 is allowable.

Claims 29-30 depend from claim 28, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Hence, Abileah, Brodsky, Chiang, and Ho fail to disclose at least one element of each of claims 29-30. Accordingly, claims 29-30 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 28.

Independent Claim 31

None of the cited references, including Abileah, Brodsky, Chiang, and Ho, disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 31. For example, Abileah, Brodsky, Chiang, and Ho do not disclose a memory of a mainframe computer that includes at least one IMS connect program that includes logic to receive an XML input request from a user computer, where the user computer is associated with an RYO client that provides software to access the IMS connect program independent of a web server associated with the mainframe server, as recited in claim 31. In contrast to claim 31, Abileah discloses receiving an XML document at an IMS connect

program from a web server. (*See* Abileah, Figure 8 and paragraph [0074]). As explained previously, Abileah does not disclose receiving an XML input request at an IMS connect program from a user computer independent of a web server, as recited in claim 31.

Further, in contrast to claim 31, Brodsky discloses receiving an XML document at an IMS connect program from a web server. (*See* Brodsky, Figure 8 and paragraph [0105]). As explained previously, Brodsky does not disclose receiving an XML input request at an IMS connect program from a user computer independent of a web server, as recited in claim 31. Additionally, in contrast to claim 31, Chiang discloses receiving an XML document at an IMS connect program from a web server. (*See* Chiang, Figure 8 and paragraph [0077]). As explained previously, Chiang does not disclose receiving an XML input request at an IMS connect program from a user computer independent of a web server, as recited in claim 31. Also in contrast to claim 31, Ho discloses receiving an XML document at an IMS connect program from a web server. (*See* Ho, Figure 8 and paragraph [0088]). As explained previously, Ho does not disclose receiving an XML input request at an IMS connect program from a user computer independent of a web server, as recited in claim 31. Hence, claim 31 is allowable.

Claims 32-40 depend from claim 31, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Hence, Abileah, Brodsky, Chiang, and Ho fail to disclose at least one element of each of claims 32-40. Accordingly, claims 32-40 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 31.

Further, the dependent claims recite additional features that are not disclosed or suggested by Abileah, Brodsky, Chiang, and Ho. For example, claim 39 recites at least one IMS connect program that includes logic to transmit an XML output response to a user computer via a communication path that is independent of a web server associated with a mainframe server. As explained previously, Abileah, Brodsky, Chiang, and Ho do not disclose an IMS connect program communicating with a user computer independent of a web server associated with a mainframe server, as recited in claim 39. For this additional reason, claim 39 is allowable.

Independent Claim 41

None of the cited references, including Abileah, Brodsky, Chiang, and Ho, disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 41. For example, Abileah, Brodsky, Chiang, and Ho do not disclose receiving a first XML input request at an IMS connect program from a first user computer via a first communication path and receiving a second XML input request at the IMS connect program from a second user computer via a second communication path, where the second communication path is independent of the first communication path, as recited in claim 41. In contrast to claim 41, Abileah discloses receiving an XML document at an IMS connect program via only a first communication path, that is, from a user computer via a web server. (See Abileah, Figure 8 and paragraph [0074]). Abileah does not disclose that XML documents can be received at the IMS connect program via a second communication path, such as a communication path that does not include the web server. Thus, Abileah does not disclose receiving a first XML input request at an IMS connect program from a first user computer via a first communication path and receiving a second XML input request at the IMS connect program from a second user computer via a second communication path that is independent of the first communication path, as recited in claim 41.

Further, in contrast to claim 41, Brodsky discloses receiving an XML document at an IMS connect program via only a first communication path, that is, from a user computer via a web server. (See Brodsky, Figure 8 and paragraph [0105]). Brodsky does not disclose that XML documents can be received at the IMS connect program via a second communication path, such as a communication path that does not include the web server. Thus, Brodsky does not disclose receiving a first XML input request at an IMS connect program from a first user computer via a first communication path and receiving a second XML input request at the IMS connect program from a second user computer via a second communication path that is independent of the first communication path, as recited in claim 41. Additionally, in contrast to claim 41, Chiang discloses receiving an XML document at an IMS connect program via only a first communication path, that is, from a user computer via a web server. (See Chiang, Figure 8 and paragraph [0077]). Chiang does not disclose that XML documents can be received at the IMS connect program via a second communication path, such as a communication path that does not

include the web server. Thus, Chiang does not disclose receiving a first XML input request at an IMS connect program from a first user computer via a first communication path and receiving a second XML input request at the IMS connect program from a second user computer via a second communication path that is independent of the first communication path, as recited in claim 41. Also in contrast to claim 41, Ho discloses receiving an XML document at an IMS connect program via only a first communication path, that is, from a user computer via a web server. (See Ho, Figure 8 and paragraph [0088]). Ho does not disclose that XML documents can be received at the IMS connect program via a second communication path, such as a communication path that does not include the web server. Thus, Ho does not disclose receiving a first XML input request at an IMS connect program from a first user computer via a first communication path and receiving a second XML input request at the IMS connect program from a second user computer via a second communication path that is independent of the first communication path, as recited in claim 41. Hence, claim 41 is allowable.

Claims 42-48 depend from claim 41, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Hence, Abileah, Brodsky, Chiang, and Ho fail to disclose at least one element of each of claims 42-48. Accordingly, claims 42-48 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 41.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the references applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims.


Any changes to the claims in this amendment, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

10-4-2007
Date



Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342
Attorney for Applicant(s)
TOLER SCHAFFER LLP
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)